

## Remarks

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Claim 5 has been added. Claims 3-5 are now pending. Claim 3 has been amended to clarify the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

### **II. OBJECTION TO THE TITLE**

The Title has been objected to because the Examiner believes that the title is not descriptive. Applicants have replaced the title.

### **III. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION**

The Specification has been objected to due to an informality. Applicants have amended the Specification to address the informality. No new matter has been added.

### **IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3 AND 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,805,442 to Crater et al. (the "Crater patent"). It is respectfully submitted that the Crater patent does not anticipate either of claims 3 or 4, for at least the following reasons.

The present invention relates to a system in which a data-utilizing component can be developed independently of a data-supplying component. In such a system, there is no direct data exchange capability between a server (i.e., the data-supplying component) and a client (i.e., the data-utilizing component). Instead, the data exchange take place exclusively through an external control element. In this system, no knowledge about any possibility communication relationship exists for the client at design time. In particular, the client has no explicit call code, which would be implementable only if the communication relationship planned for runtime were already known at design time. Claim 3, for example, recites that the

client has no explicit call code. (See, e.g., Specification, page 19, lines 22-29.) Claim 4 depends from claim 3.

The Crater patent merely describes classic browsers, which have conventional knowledge regarding communication relationships. For example, in the Crater patent, an explicit call code is provided in the form of a URL. See, e.g., the Crater patent, col. 5, line 45 et seq.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Crater patent does not anticipate either of claims 3 or 4. Withdrawal of the rejection of the rejection of claims 3 and 4 is requested.

**V. NEW CLAIM 5**

Claim 5 has been added to recite further features of the present invention. For example, claim 5 recites "wherein communication relationships for the client are not known at design time of the system." In the Crater patent, communications relationships, such as an explicit call code in the form of a URL, are clearly known at design time.

VI. CONCLUSION

Each of the issues raised by the Examiner has been addressed. It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Passage to issuance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*[Handwritten signature]* 11/26/09

Dated: 17 OCT 2009

By:

*[Handwritten signature]*  
Richard L. Mayer  
Reg. No. 22,490

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200